

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

BOBBY LEE FAIR, JR.,

Case No. 3:20-cv-00491-MMD-WGC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

LAKES CROSSING CENTER ADMIN., et al.,

Defendants.

LAKES CROSSING CENTER ADMIN., et al.,

Defendants.

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 12, 2021, United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court within 30 days, or face dismissal. (ECF No. 9.) The 30-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
2 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
3 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
4 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
5 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
6 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
7 120; *Fordik*, 862 F.2d at 1269-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 52.

8 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
9 resolving this litigation, and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
10 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
11 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
12 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
13 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring
14 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors weighing in favor
15 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
16 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
17 requirement. See *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779
18 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the
19 Court within 30 days expressly warned Plaintiff that, if he failed to timely comply with the
20 order, his case would be subject to dismissal. (ECF No. 9.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate
21 warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file
22 his updated address within 30 days.

23 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
24 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's April 12, 2021
25 order. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue any of his claims, he must file a complaint in a new
26 action.

27 | //

1 It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF Nos. 1,
2) is denied as moot.

3 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
4 No other documents may be filed in this closed case.

5 DATED THIS 17th Day of May 2021.

6
7
8 
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE